

4894
A
SPECIMEN
OF AN
ESSAY
FOR

To Find out and Ascertain
THE

True or Original Reading

OF THE

HEBREW Text,

In all places where it Now differs,

Either from the

SEPTUAGINT Version,

Or from the

SAMARITAN Pentateuch.

By **EDWARD WELLS, D.D.** Rector of
Cotesbach in Leicester-shire.

OXFORD:

Printed for *William Wells* Bookseller in Oxford. 1920.

Imprimatur,

ARTH. CHARLETT,

Novemb.

1720.



THE PREFACE.

AS there are many and considerable *Vari-
ous Readings* between the *present He-
brew* Text and the *Septuagint* Version of
the Hebrew Bible: So to find out *whence* the
said Variety has arisen, and to ascertain as
much as may be, *which* is the *true* or *original*
Reading of the Hebrew Text, is a Work long
since recommended by Men of the greatest
Learning and Judgment, as * *most highly*
Worth the Undertaking. That, which has
hitherto hinder'd it notwithstanding from
being (as I know of) Undertaken, may well
be supposed to be, partly the Difficulty and
Length of the Work, and partly the Doubt of
its meeting with a Recompence suitable to the
Labour and Expence of performing and pub-
lishing it: Few, in comparison of the Number
of *Scholars*, or even of *Divines*, being Willing or

(*) Thus Bishop *Walton* in his Ninth Prolegom. to the Polyglot Bible at the end of Sect. 46. styles it, *Opus viris qui judicio, doctrina, & otio abundant, Dignissimum.*

The P R E F A C E.

at least Able to put themselves to the Expence of *such a Critical* part of Learning, *without which*, however *Useful* or *Satisfactory* it be *in it self*, they may make a *great Figure in the World*.

But these Discouragements have not hinder'd me from *attempting* the said Work, being willing to *Struggle with the Difficulty* of it as well as I can ; and to go *thro'* with It as Health and the Circumstances of my Function and other Affairs will permit, if there be given *any* Encouragement so to do, tho' it be *no more* than will *barely discharge the Expence of Publisbing*. On this last account I have judg'd it Advisable, to publish now at First only this *Specimen for a Trial*. If this Trial succeeds, I purpose (GOD willing) to publish about the like Number of Sheets Once in a Month or Two or thereabout, as my aforesaid Circumstances shall give me Leave. And because *One kind* of Various Readings needs be taken Notice of *no more than Once*, and *Very many* Various Readings are of the *same* or *like Kind* ; therefore the Work will by these means *lessen apace* in the Progress of it ; and will not I think prove of so *great a length* as has been imagin'd, and
con.

The PREFACE.

consequently may be brought *to an End in much less Time* than has been suppos'd. But if this Trial does not succeed, I shall however *have the Satisfaction* of having *offer'd my Service* to the Publick on so *good or useful* an Account.

To render the Work such, as that it may be perused by the *greater* Number of Readers, I shall not, unless on some special Occasions, mention therein the *Hebrew* or *Greek* words themselves, but the *English* of 'em.

And tho' it be a Controversy that has much exercised the Learned, *To which the Preference* ought to be given, whether to the *present Hebrew* Text, or to the *Septuagint* Version: Yet I am *no ways prejudiced* by any Opinion beforehand taken up, in Favour of either Side or Party. I am *concern'd only for the TRUTH*; and am therefore *Equally pleas'd*, whether the *True* or *Original Reading* of the Hebrew Text be found in the *present Hebrew* Bible, or the *Footsteps thereof preserv'd in the Septuagint* Version.

And the like is to be understood concerning Me, in respect to the Differences between the *common Hebrew* and the *Samaritan* Copies of the Pentateuch. For as I go along, I shall
also

The P R E F A C E.

also take Notice of *such Differences*, even where the Hebrew and Septuagint agree, that so the Work may be the *more Compleat* in its Kind.

There being several things to be *premis'd*, that so the Reader may the Better see, *By what Rules I guide Myself* in this Work; I have compris'd 'em under the following *Propositions*, as being the Shortest and Clearest way to convey to the Reader a Right Notion of the Grounds I go upon.

Cotesbach,
Sep. 2. 1720.

PROPO.

PROPOSITIONS.

I.

THE Scriptures of the *Old and New Testament* were written by *Divine Inspiration*.

II.

Notwithstanding which, the said Scriptures were *Formerly liable to Mistakes in Transcribing*, as they are *Now a-days* to *Mistakes in Printing*.

III.

That many such Mistakes have *actually happen'd*, is evident from the *Many Various Readings*, that are *Extant*, of the *Text of the Old*, as well as *New Testament*.

What the Jews call *Keri Cetib* are no other than the more ancient *Various Readings* of the *Hebrew Text*. For where there are such, the *wrong Reading* in their esteem is continued nevertheless to be *writ in the Text*, whence it is call'd the *Cetib*, which signifies *that which is written*; and the *true Reading* is writ in the *Margin*, whence it is call'd the *Keri*, which signifies *that which is to be read*. And since the *Jews themselves* scruple not *Publickly to Own*, that there are *Various Readings* of the *Hebrew Text*, 'tis strange any *Christians* should be so weak in *Judgment*, as to go about to *deny or conceal* it, out of an *ill-grounded Fear* of what is taken Notice of, and *obviated or removed* by the two following Propositions, on this very Account.

IV.

Such *Various Readings* do *not derogate from the Authority* of the *Holy Scriptures*: forasmuch as either they *alter not* the *Sense of the Text*, being only *Interpolations* taken from *other Texts*, and added where they occur by way of *Explanation*, or the like; or if they *do alter* the *Sense*, it is in *Matters of less Concern*, or which *concern not Salvation*; or lastly, *if there be Any* that *alter* the *Sense* in reference to *Duties requisite to Salvation*, they may easily be *corrected*, or

PROPOSITIONS.

the *true* Reading may easily be *discern'd*, by the *general Analogy* of other Texts of Scripture relating to the same Duties.

What is laid down in the foregoing Proposition, will appear from what is contain'd in the following *Specimen*, as to the *two* former Particulars mention'd in the said Proposition.

V.

For the same Reasons mention'd in the foregoing Proposition, the Various Readings of the Bible do *by no means* prove the *Necessity of an Infallible Judge in Controversy*, as the Papists would hence falsely infer.

Tho' several good and learned *Protestants*, for Want also of Judiciousness or Duly weighing the Matter, have been induced out of Fear of the Consequences obviated in this and the foregoing Proposition, either flatly to deny, or at least to endeavour to conceal, that there are *Any* or *so many* Various Readings, especially in the Old Testament: Yet the Generality, if not all, the more learned *Protestants* have now a-days laid aside that Fear, as being not only *ill-grounded*, but also obstructing that good Use which may be made of the Various Readings, to find out and restore the true Original Reading. Whence on the other hand Learned and Industrious Men have for some Years past employ'd their Pains to collect all the Various Readings of the Bible, and to publish them in order to find out and ascertain the True or Original Readings, agreeable to the Design of the Work, of which what follows these Propositions is a *Specimen*.

VI.

Tho' the Various Readings of the Bible do not justly derogate from the Authority of the Bible; yet it *is*, and has long since been recommended by Learned and Judicious Persons as, a *Very Useful Work*, to endeavour to find out and ascertain the true or Original Readings of the Bible. See the *Preface* hereto.

VII.

Such Means, as by the Common Consent of Learned and Judicious Persons, are adjudg'd proper to find out and ascertain the True or Original Readings in *Common Authors*: the same or like Means must therefore be likewise proper to find out and ascertain the True or Original Readings of the Bible; there being no difference to be assign'd in this respect between the Sacred and Common Writings.

Where-

PROPOSITIONS.

VIII.

Wherefore the proper Means to find out and ascertain the True or Original Reading of the *Hebrew Text* or *Old Testament*, is by *comparing parallel Places* of Scripture, and the present *Hebrew Copies together*, and with the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, and with the *Ancient Versions*, and with the *Citations* of the *Old Testament*, made by the *Primitive Fathers* or other *Writers* in their Works; and then making a *Judgment suitable to all Circumstances duly weigh'd*. Among which Circumstances, the *Antiquity* and *Goodness* of the *Copies* or *Versions* so compar'd ought to have a due Regard.

IX.

The *Samaritan Copy* of the *Pentateuch* in our *Polyglot Bible* was at first transcrib'd from the *Pentateuch* set forth by *Ezra* after the Return of the Jews from the *Babylonish Captivity*; and it was so transcrib'd *many Years before the Septuagint Version*, and consequently before *Any other Version now Extant*, was made. It appears also to have been transcrib'd with *good Care*, none or few material Faults being to be found therein, which can be properly laid to the Charge of the Transcriber. So that in respect both of its *Antiquity* and *Goodness*, there ought (*ceteris paribus*) a great Regard to be had to the said *Samaritan Copy*.

That the *Samaritan Pentateuch* was at first transcrib'd from the *Pentateuch* set forth by *Ezra* after his Revise of the *Holy Scriptures*, is manifest from the said *Samaritan Pentateuch* having all the *Additions*, which are generally acknowledg'd to have been made by *Ezra*, to the *Books of Moses*, as well as the other *Books of the Old Testament*.

It is also generally acknowledg'd, that the *Samaritan Pentateuch* was at first transcrib'd, upon *Manasseh*, a Son of the *High Priest*, fleeing to *Samaria*, and there putting himself under the Protection of *Sanballat*, whose Daughter he had married, rather than he would part with his Wife; and being there made *High-Priest* of the Temple built on *Mount Gerizim* near *Samaria*. Now whether this was done in the Reign of *Darius Nothus*, as seems most probable, or afterwards in the Reign of *Darius Codomannus*; yet either way it holds true, that the *Samaritan Pentateuch* was at first transcrib'd, *Many Years before the Septuagint Version* was made or set about, forasmuch as it was not set about till *many Years after the Death of Darius Codomannus*; namely, after the Death of *Alexander the Great*, and after his General *Ptolemy Lagides* had made himself King of *Egypt*, and was succeeded by his Son *Ptolemy Philadelphus*.

PROPOSITIONS.

X.

The *Septuagint Version* of the Pentateuch and Prophets (according to the import of the Word *Prophets* among the Jews) if not of the whole Old Testament, is the *most ancient* of all other Versions of the Holy Scriptures, at least Now a-days extant. And it is not only *for the most part a Close Version*, but it is also *follow'd by the Apostles and Evangelists themselves* in the Writings of the New Testament, even *where it differs* from the present Hebrew. So that on account of all the three foremention'd Respects, especially the last, a *principal Regard* ought to be had *to the Septuagint Version, ceteris paribus*, or all other Circumstances being *duly weigh'd*, and *None Out weighing*.

It is generally granted that the *Pentateuch* was translated in the Reign of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*. And such as will not allow the Rest of the said Version to have been made at the same time, yet place the said Version of the *Prophets* no lower than the time of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, who died about 164 Years before Christ. So that the *Septuagint Version* of the *Prophets* as well as *Pentateuch* was many Years before the *Chaldee Versions* of *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*, these two not living more than about Forty Years before Christ; and yet their Versions are look'd on by All as the most Ancient in the *Chaldee Language*, and of all the other *Oriental Versions*. And here it is observable, that under the Title of the *Prophets* the Jews comprehend not only *Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel* and the *twelve lesser Prophets*; but also the Books of *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, the two Books of *Samuel*, and the two Books of *Kings*. So that according to this last Opinion and the meaning of the Word *Prophets* among the Jews, the Far greatest part of the Bible, even two parts of three or more, was translated *afore* or *in* the time of *Antiochus Epiphanes*. As such as do not allow the whole *Septuagint Version* to be made at one time, do not assign (as I can find) the time, when the *Hagiography*, or Rest of the Old Testament, besides the *Pentateuch* and *Prophets* was translated into the said *Greek Version*, so neither do they gainsay (as I can find) but it was *All done before* the *Chaldee Versions*.

But I cannot but observe, that the Reasons commonly brought to prove, that the *Septuagint Version*, was not made *All at One time*, or in *One Reign*, and by *One set of Men*, are in my Opinion not *conclusive*. For if *Difference of Style*, or of *Translating the same Hebrew Words or Phrases*, or of *Accuracy in the translation*, be *conclusive Arguments* that the *whole Old Testament* was not translated into *Greek* under the single Reign of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, and by *One set of Men*; then the same Arguments must be allow'd to be *as Conclusive*, that the *Whole Old Testament* or Bible was not translated into *English* in the single Reign of *King James I.* and by *One set of Men*. For the same or like *Difference of Style*, and of *translating the same Hebrew Words or Phrases*, and of *Accuracy in the translation*, may be shewn in our present common *English Version*. Notwithstanding all which it is certain, that our *English Version* was made *All at one Time* or under the *foresaid Reign*, and by *One set of Men*. And therefore notwithstanding all the *foresaid Objections*, it may hold likewise most True, that the *whole Septuagint Ver.*

PROPOSITIONS.

Version was made at One time or under the Reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and by One set of Men. So far are the foresaid Objections from being Conclusive, much more from amounting to a full Demonstration, as some I find think. All that such Differences in a Translation can well or probably prove, is this, that the said Translation was not all along perform'd jointly by the Whole set of Men concern'd therein, but was divided among 'em, One or more doing One part thereof, and several Others doing the several other Parts. And as this was the Case as to our English translation, so it might be the real Case of the Septuagint translation, and will answer some other Objections made against it.

XI.

Next in *Antiquity* to the Septuagint Version are the Two *Targums*, that is, the *Chaldee* Versions or Paraphrases, of *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*; whereof the former is of the Pentateuch, and the latter of the Prophets, according to the acceptance of the Word *Prophets* among the Jews. That of *Onkelos* is of good Use, forasmuch as it is generally a Close Version, rendring the Original Word for Word, so that the Reading of the Hebrew Copy made use of by *Onkelos*, may from his Version for the most part be easily Known: Which can't be said of the *Targum* of *Jonathan*, it being in a manner altogether a *Paraphrase*, and not a Version.

Under the Title of the *Prophets*, the Jews (as above has been observed) comprehend the Books of *Joshua*, *Judges*, *Ruth*, *Samuel*, and the *Kings*, as well as *Isaiah*, &c. and so *Jonathan's Targum* is on all these. There are other *Targums* of the Pentateuch and Prophets, and also of the Hagiography. But they are of much less *Antiquity* and Note, especially that of the Hagiography; for which reason as well as others, they are less Useful in this Work.

XII.

The *Syriac* Version generally placed under the Hebrew in our Polyglot Bible is a close Version, generally rendring the Hebrew Text Word for Word; and it was made in or quickly after the Apostolical Age. So that on account both of its *Antiquity* and Closeness Regard is to be had thereto, as being of good Use to help discover, What was the Reading of the Hebrew Copy made use of by the Author of the said Version.

XIII.

PROPOSITIONS.

XIII.

The *Arabic* Version placed with the others in our Polyglot Bible is of *less Antiquity* than the *Syriac*; and tho' it renders the Hebrew generally *Close* enough, or *Word for Word*, yet it do's Often *not give the literal* Meaning of the Hebrew Word, but *that which* the Author of the said Version conceiv'd *rather was to be understood* by the said Word. So that altho' it may be of *some*, yet it is of *less* use on both the foresaid accounts, in this Work.

I find some think this Version was not made immediately from the Hebrew, but from the Septuagint Version. But I see no good Reason for this Opinion, as far as I have had occasion to consult it hitherto.

XIV.

The *Persic* Version of the Pentateuch placed in the Appendix to the fourth Tome of the Polyglot Bible, is a *Close* Version, but of a *much later* Date than any of the former. On which last account it is of *much less Use* to discover, What was the *Original* Reading of the Hebrew Text, than Otherwise it would be.

The Lateness of this Version manifestly appears from the Authors rendring *Babel* by *Bagdad*, this last being a City built by the Caliph *Almansor* about A. D. 762. as is observ'd by Dr. *Grave* in his short Annotations on the said Version in the sixth or last Tome of the Polyglot Bible.

I need not say any thing of the *Ethiopic* Version here, forasmuch as in our Polyglot Bible there is publish'd the said Version only of the *Psalms*, *Canticles*, some other *sacred Songs*, and of the *New Testament*. So it will be time enough to speak of it, when I come to the *Psalms*:

I pass by likewise the *present Vulgar Latin* Version, as being a *Mixture* of the *Old Vulgar Latin* or *Italic*, and *St. Jerom's* Version, with some other *Alterations* made thereto: So that it is of *no Use* as to this present Design, unless it can be distinguish'd by comparing it with the Quotations of the *Primitive* Latin Fathers and other Writers that liv'd before *St. Jerom's* Translation was in Vogue, What was taken from the *Old Vulgar Latin*, or *Italic* Version, and What from *St. Jerom's*. For the *Old Vulgar Latin* Version being made immediately from the *Septuagint*, is of good Use to ascertain what was the Reading of the *Septuagint* in those *Early* days, or the *Apostolical* age, wherein the said *Latin* Version was made. And *St. Jerom's* Version is of Use to know What was the Reading of the Hebrew Copy made use of by him in his Translation, unless where there might be some *special Motive* to induce *St. Jerom* to follow the *Septuagint*, or which is the same, to retain the *Old Vulgar Latin* Version.

XV.

PROPOSITIONS.

XV.

Forasmuch as such of the several Versions aforesaid, as differ from the *present Hebrew Text*, do also in several Instances differ *One from the Other*; therefore there is *no good Ground* to suppose, that *where* the said Versions differ from the *present Hebrew Text*, *there* the Authors of 'em follow'd some other Version afore extant. But it is *most Reasonable* to suppose, that *all such Differences* in the said Versions did arise from the *then Various Readings* of the Hebrew Text, in the *Copies made use of by the Authors* of the said Versions.

XVI.

If *no good or probable Reason or Account* can be given, *why or how* the *Original Reading* of the *Hebrew Text* came to be *alter'd*; but *there* can be given a *good or probable Reason or Account*, *why or how* the *Original Hebrew Reading* was *not preserv'd in the Samaritan Pentateuch*, or *not follow'd in the Septuagint, or other Versions*: Then, *ceteris paribus*, the *present Reading* of the *Hebrew Text* is *most Reasonably* to be *adjudg'd* the *Original Reading*. And on the contrary, if a *good or probable Reason or Account* can be given, *why or how* the *Original Hebrew Reading* came to be *alter'd* in the *present Hebrew Text*; but *no such Reason or Account* can be given, *why or how* the *Original Hebrew Reading* came, either *not to be preserv'd in the Samaritan Pentateuch*, or *not to be follow'd in the Septuagint, or other Versions*: Then, *ceteris paribus*, the *present Reading* of the *Hebrew* is *most Reasonably* to be *judg'd* *Not the Original Reading*; but *that* is to be esteem'd the *Original*, which is *confirm'd to be so by the Best Testimonies* in respect of the *Antiquity and Goodness* of the *Copies or Versions*, wherein it is found, according to what has been said in the foregoing Propositions.

Having thus compris'd in the foregoing Propositions, what I judge requisite to be premised for the Reader's better Understanding, by what Rules I guide my self in the following Specimen, I now proceed

PROPOSITIONS.

to the Specimen itself, therein to find out and ascertain the Original Reading of the Hebrew Text, according to the said Rules. Only I shall here further observe, that as it appears from the foregoing Propositions, that the Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek Languages are of chief Moment in this Matter, so I have such a competent Knowledge of them, that I have compar'd them themselves as I have gone along, and particularly the Hebrew and Samaritan Copies themselves. As for the other Oriental Versions, I rely on the Goodness of the Latin Versions set by them in our Polyglot Bible.

A Speci.

A Specimen of an Essay to find out and ascertain the True or Original Reading of the HEBREW Text, &c.

GENESIS.

Chap. I.
Verf. 6, 7.

HERE we meet with the *first* Difference between the present Hebrew Text and the Septuagint. I.
The Septuagint
Version faulty. This is this: The Clause, *And it was so*, is placed in the Septuagint Version at the end of the *Sixth* Verse, whereas it stands in the Hebrew at the end of the *Seventh* Verse. Now to discover which of these *two* is the Original Reading, according to the Propositions afore laid down,

1. I observe that not only *all the Ancient Versions* mention'd in the foresaid Propositions, but also the *Samaritan Pentateuch* agrees herein with the present Hebrew Text. Whence it may be Reasonably infer'd, that the several *Hebrew Copies made Use of*, either by the Transcriber of the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, or by the Authors of the Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, and Persic Versions, did likewise agree with the present Hebrew Text, according to *Prop. 15*. So that from what has been Already observ'd, could no more be said, it may be Reasonably infer'd, that the present Hebrew Reading is the Original Reading. But this may be confirm'd by the two following Observations. Namely, according to *Prop. 16*.

2. I observe that there is a *plain Reason*, why such a *Transposition* of the Clause we are speaking of, might be made in the Septuagint: viz. because it might seem to the Transposer *more agreeable*, not only to the *Natural Order of Method*, but also to the *Order observ'd by Moses* in the following part of this Chapter.

First, It might seem more Agreeable to the *Natural Order of Method*, so to do; because the said Clause, *And it was so*, may in short imply no more, than what is afterwards *more fully express'd* in V. 7. and therefore should stand *first* according to the *Natural Order of Method*, it being agreeable thereto to set the *short Expression before the Explication* of the said Expression. And according to this Opinion

of the Transposer, the Sense of V. 6, 7. will be this: 6 *And God said let there be a Firmament, (&c.) and let it divide the Waters from the Waters, AND IT WAS SO: 7 Namely God made the Firmament, &c.*

Secondly, Such a Transposition of the said Clause might well seem more Agreeable to the Method observ'd by *Moses* in the sequel of this Chapter. For thus we find V. 9. presently after God's saying, *Let the Waters, &c. and let the Dry-land appear*; this same Clause, *And it was so*, added at the end of the said Verse, exactly as in the present Reading of the Septuagint Version the said Clause is added V. 6. presently after God's saying, *Let there be a Firmament, &c.* And it is evident that the said Clause is so put V. 9. to imply, that God caused the Waters to be gather'd into one Place, &c. according to what he had commanded at the beginning of the said Verse.

Again V. 11. we find the same Clause, *And it was so*, placed just as it is in the Septuagint V. 6. viz. Immediately after God's saying, *Let the Earth bring forth Grass, &c.* And then V. 12. the *Explication* of the said Clause follows expressly and immediately, viz. *And*, or rather *Namely, the Earth brought forth Grass, &c.* Just as the like Explication follows V. 7. after the said Clause as it is placed at the End of V. 6. in the Septuagint Version. And the like placing of the said Clause in the Hebrew, agreeable to the place thereof in V. 6. of the Septuagint Version, is also to be found expressly v. 15 and 16, and again v. 24 and 25.

II.
Whence probably many or most of the Differences between the Hebrew and Septuagint did arise.

Wherefore some studious and Critical Person that read the Septuagint Version, making the Observations aforementioned, might thereby be induced to think, that the said Clause did not stand at the end of V. 7. in its proper Place, either according to the Natural Order of Method, or according to the Method observ'd by *Moses* in the following part of this Chapter, but that it was put there thro' the mistake of some Transcriber, whereas it should properly, or agreeably to both Methods aforementioned, be placed at the end of v. 6. And hereupon he might strike it out of the End of v. 7. where it afore stood in the Septuagint agreeably to the Hebrew, and write it where it now stands in the Septuagint; or else and rather, he might only write it in the Margin of his Septuagint Copy, with a Reference to the end of v. 6. as a Critical Observation that he judg'd it should rather come in there for the Reasons aforesaid. And the said Person being likely esteem'd for his Learning, hence Others might be induced to follow his Opinion, and so the Clause might in time, be taken out of the Margin and inserted into the Version it self in the place he refer'd to, as has been often done in other like Cases: And from the like Cause may very well be suppos'd Very many if not most of the various Readings between the present Hebrew Text and Septuagint Version to have arisen, as will appear as we go on. And 'tis

'tis not unlikely but they might thus arise many or most of them from the Critical Observations of *One and the same Person*, who was peculiarly inclined to such Criticism, and studious of the Scriptures in the Septuagint Version. But to return to the particular various Readings here under Consideration.

Thirdly, It remains to observe further, according to Prop. 16. that no Reason can be assign'd why any Change should be made in the Hebrew Text, supposing the Clause, *And it was so*, had originally stood at the end of v. 6. For then it would have stood, as afore is observ'd, in the like place it stands in thro' the following part of this Chapter, and also in the place that might seem most proper for it according to the Natural Order of Method.

If it be ask'd, *Why* then did *Moses* not place it at the end of v. 6. but at the end of v. 7? To this it would be sufficient to answer in general, that 'tis Evident that the sacred Penmen did not always stand on Accuracy of Writing in this or the like respects. But I think another and very good Reason may be given, for *Moses* placing the said Clause here differently from the manner of his placing it in the remainder of this Chapter. For as the said Clause may be understood to imply in short, what is either more fully expressed immediately after, as v. 12, 16, 25; or is to be understood as v. 9: So the said Clause may also be taken in a somewhat different Sense, or so as to explain in what manner God is to be understood to have made things at the Creation: Namely, that He only spake or Will'd, and it was so: Agreeably whereto the meaning of v. 7. will be this: *God made the Firmament and divided the Waters, &c. Namely it was so: i. e. Namely, the Firmament was made and the Waters divided, on God's barely saying or Willing it should be so.* Wherefore the said Clause being thus capable of being understood Exegetically, or by way of Explication, of what goes before it v. 7. is therefore in this Sense Regularly and Accurately placed at the end of the said Verse. Whereas the said Clause being elsewhere in this Chapter taken to denote in short, what is more fully express'd afterwards, is therefore in that Sense Regularly placed in the said other texts, tho' it be differently from v. 7.

To conclude then this Matter. Since the Samaritan Pentateuch and all the other aforesaid ancient Versions, agree with the present Hebrew in placing the said Clause at the end of v. 7. And since also so plain a Reason can be given, why the Septuagint Version might be alter'd; but no Reason can be given, why any Alteration should be made in the Hebrew, had the said Clause stood Originally at the end of v. 6: on these Considerations it may be infer'd without reasonable Doubt, that the present Reading of the Hebrew Text is the true or original Reading, and that the Septuagint Version has been here alter'd from what it was at the First.

III.

The Hebrew Reading justified as to Order of Method.

IV.

The Sum of what has been said, as to the first Various Reading.

What

V. What has been said in reference to this *First* difference will be applicable in the main to *all* Differences of the like Nature, which will make I think the far greatest Part of them that follow. And therefore tho' what has been *requisite* to be said on this first difference, has run out to a considerable *Length*, yet it will be a means to *shorten much*, what would otherwise be requisite to be said in all like Cases, namely by *referring* in great measure to what is here said, as in the very next difference.

VI. The Septuagint Version faulty again. V. 8. Here the Septuagint runs thus: *And God called the Firmament Heaven: and God saw that it was Good: and the Evening and the Morning were the second Day*: Whereas the Clause, *And God saw that it was Good*, is not in the Hebrew. That the present Hebrew Reading is the true or original one, and that the Septuagint has been here alter'd, may be infer'd beyond reasonable Doubt by the *very same or like Means*, as are afore made use of in respect to the first difference, *mutatis mutandis*. For the Samaritan Pentateuch and all the other aforesaid old Versions agree herein with the Hebrew. And withal there is a *plain Reason or Account* to be given, *why* or *how* the said Clause might be here inserted into the Septuagint, *viz.* by means of the aforesaid or some other Critical person observing, that the said Clause is added in like Cases thro' the following part of this Chapter, as v. 10, 12, 18, &c. Whence he judg'd it *proper to be added here*, as having been omitted only by *Overfight*. Whereupon he inserted it here into his Copy, or at least writ it in the Margin, whence it quickly crept into the Copy. But on the other hand, supposing the said Clause, *and God saw that it was Good*, to have been here originally in the Hebrew, *no good or other Reason* can be given why it *should be left out*; but it must be only supposed to have been done by meer *Overfight* or *Heedlessness*. Which to suppose without any good grounds, especially in respect of the *Omission* not of a *single Word* but of such a *whole Clause*, is altogether Unreasonable.

VII. The Septuagint Version here also faulty. V. 9. Here is another like Difference between the Hebrew and Septuagint, the latter adding after this Clause, *And it was so*, this which follows, *And the Waters under the Heaven were gather'd into their Places, and the Dry-land appear'd*: Whereas no such Addition is in the Hebrew. Now the Samaritan Pentateuch and all the other aforesaid old Versions agreeing herein with the Hebrew, and there being *no good Reason or Account*, why or how it should be *left out* of the Hebrew, if there Originally; and there being a *plain Reason or Account*, why or how the said Addition might be made in the Septuagint, *viz.* by the aforesaid or some other Criticks observing, that the like Addition is made by *Moses* v. 12, 16, and 25, after the same Clause, *and it was so*: on these Considerations the present Reading of the Hebrew is doubtless the *Original One*.

V. 11. Here we meet with *two* small Differences between the Hebrew and the Septuagint. The first is, that the Septuagint adds, *After Kind and Likeness*, presently next to *the Herb yielding Seed*, whereas the Hebrew has no such Expression there. The second Difference is, that the Hebrew has, *After his Kind*, next to *the Fruit-tree yielding Fruit*; whereas the Septuagint omits it there and adds it after, *whose Seed is in it-self*. There is no good Reason to doubt, but that the Hebrew is in both Cases the Original Reading, thereto agreeing the Samaritan Pentateuch, Chaldee, Arabic and Persic Versions. And these small differences might easily arise in the Septuagint, either from *Transcribers trusting to their Memory* herein, or the very Septuagint Translators *not thinking it Material* to keep here *Closely* to the placing of the said Expression, *After kind*, as it is in the Hebrew; especially it being placed v. 12. in the Hebrew *just as it is* here v. 11. in the Septuagint. On this account I need but mention the *Syriac Versions* agreeing herein with the Septuagint as to its *first* difference here with the Hebrew: the same being occasion'd most likely in the Syriac Version, by one of the same means mention'd before in respect to the Septuagint. And indeed was this all the Difference it would hardly *deserve the Name* of a Various Reading, so much Liberty in altering the bare place of words being taken by and allow'd to the best Translators.

But it remains to be observ'd, that both on this v. 11. and also v. 12. the Septuagint add, *And after Likeness*, to *After kind*; which there is nothing to answer to in the Hebrew, or Samaritan Pentateuch, or any of the aforesaid old Versions. And it is not to be doubted, but *καὶ ὁμοιωσιν* was put at first by some Critick, in the Margin of his Greek Bible, by way of *Explication* of *κατὰ γένος*, being taken from v. 26. And from the Margin it was, as usual, taken into the Greek Text itself.

It is further to be here observ'd, that in *this* Verse we meet *first* with *any* Difference between the Hebrew and Samaritan Copies; and those here met with are but *small* Ones. The Samaritan Copy has, *And the fruit-tree, &c.* whereas the Hebrew leaves out the Particle *and*. The Septuagint agrees herein with the Samaritan Pentateuch, as do also the Syriac, Arabic, and Persic Versions; if the *Latin* translations of 'em be *exact*. This Condition I put in, because I find the *Latin translation* of the Targum of Onkelos *has* also *And*, tho' the said Chaldee Version or Targum itself *has it not*, but agrees with the present Hebrew Text. 'Tis not easy to determin, which is the original Reading; it being *alike Easy* for the Transcriber of the Hebrew Copy, to *leave out* the said Particle, where it was not Necessary; as for the Transcriber of the Samaritan Copy to *put it in*, where it did not alter, but rather help the Sense. For which reason.

VIII. Another Difference, but such as deserves not to be called a Various Reading, in respect of one part of it.

IX. Whence the other Part of the said Difference did arise in the Septuagint.

X. Other small Differences between Hebrew and Samaritan Copies, as well as Septuagint Version.

reason the Septuagint Interpreters had *no need at all to scruple adding* the said Particle, tho' it *was not* in the Hebrew Copy used by them; it being no other Liberty than all Translators take in the like indifferent Cases. And indeed the Matter is so indifferent, that it does *not deserve the Name of a Various Reading* in a Translation, tho' it may do so in a *bare Transcript*, as the Samaritan Pentateuch is or should be of the Hebrew Text. Much less does that other Particular taken Notice of by Dr. *Castel* (in his part of the Collection of the Various Readings between the Hebrew and Samaritan Copies, printed in the Sixth and last Tome of our Polyglot Bible) deserve to be called a Various Reading, it being only this, that the Hebrew word *Mazriagn*, or as some pronounce it *Mazriah*, is writ in the Hebrew Copy *with the Consonant Jod*, whereas the *Jod is left out* in the Samaritan Copy. For it is apparently no more than an *Over-sight* in the Transcriber of the Samaritan Copy, the *very same word* being writ in the next Verse *with a Jod* in the Samaritan Copy, as well as in the Hebrew. Many of Dr. *Castel's* Various Readings being no other than such *immaterial differences only in writing* the same Word, I therefore judge them not worth taking Notice of. But since such *very small* differences were taken notice of in his Collection, 'tis the more strange that the Difference afore observ'd by Me in reference to the Particle *Ve* or *And*, should not likewise be taken Notice of in the said Collection; it being a *greater difference* than the *Other* taken Notice of by him in this Verse, tho' it be but a *small one in itself*: So *small*, that I shall take *no more* Notice of any *such Variety*, as to *leaving out* or *putting in* the foresaid Particle *And*, or any other such like, except it be *where it alters* the Sense.

XI.

Such small Differences no more taken Notice of.

XII.

A Various Reading here in the Hebrew Copies themselves, and the present Reading the Original one.

V. 14. Here after, *Let there be Lights in the firmament of heaven*, the Septuagint adds, *For to give light on the Earth*, which is not in the Hebrew. And since all the other Versions aforementioned agree with the Hebrew herein, it would be obvious to infer, that this Addition was taken from v. 15. and put here by way of *Criticism*, or to *explain how* the said Lights were to divide the Day from the Night. But the *Agreement* of the Samaritan Pentateuch herein with the Septuagint, causes a *New difficulty*. To say that the Samaritan Pentateuch *follow'd* herein the Septuagint Version, is to say what *can't be proved, nor is probable*. Indeed it is *altogether absurd*, to say that the *first* Transcriber (or Transcribers) of the Samaritan Copy from the Hebrew did in *this* particular choose to *follow* rather the Septuagint Version, forasmuch as the *first* Transcribing of the Samaritan Copy is acknowledg'd by All learned men in these matters to be done *Long before* the Septuagint Version was made, according to *Prop. 9*.

And

And it is no less known by the said Learned, that the *greatest Animosities* continued between the Jews and Samaritans *All along after the Septuagint Version was made*; insomuch that it is *altogether Unlikely*, that any Transcriber of the said Samaritan Copy in *After-ages* would *have any such Regard* to the Septuagint Version when made, as to *alter* their Pentateuch in any respect by a *Version made*, and so *much esteem'd* by their inveterate Enemies the Jews, as the Septuagint Version was in those days. Whence it follows, that either the Hebrew Copy, from which the Samaritan Pentateuch was at first transcrib'd, *had also this Addition*, and so there was this Various Reading in the *Hebrew Copies* themselves in those Early times; or else that some Critick among the Samaritans did put this Expression, at least in the Margin of his Pentateuch, by way of *Explication*, whence it was taken afterwards into the Text by some ignorant Transcriber. Now if there was such a Various Reading in the Hebrew Copies before the *first* Transcribing of the Samaritan Pentateuch, then the Copy used by the Septuagint Interpreters, might likewise *have the same Addition*; and so this can't be call'd properly a *Various Reading* with respect to the Septuagint, which herein *follow'd* the Hebrew Copy *made use of* in that Translation.

Nor can it be Reasonably said, that the Septuagint Version herein *follow'd* the Samaritan Pentateuch, for the last Reason above alledg'd why the Samaritan Pentateuch did not herein *follow* the Septuagint. Namely, because of the *inveterate and implacable Enmity* between the the Jews and Samaritans; which would *hinder* the Jewish Authors of the Septuagint Version from *following the Samaritan Pentateuch* in such a Case, as well as the Samaritans from *following the Septuagint Version*. Upon the whole therefore, the *Agreement* between the Samaritan Pentateuch and Septuagint Version makes it most Reasonable to conclude, that there was a *Variety of Reading* in this place, even in the *Old Hebrew Copies*. But then of the *two Readings*, *That* in the present Hebrew Text is to be look'd on as the *Original Reading*, the other being an Addition *plainly* taken from v. 15. and likely placed at first, by some Rabbi or Jewish Doctor, in the Margin of his Bible by way of *Explication*, as is afore said.

There is indeed this Difference observable between the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the present Reading of the Septuagint Version: *viz.* the Samaritan Pentateuch expresses the said Addition in the *very same* words, as are found v. 15. But in the Septuagint Version the Addition is express'd in this v. 14. by *οἱ παῖδες ἐν τῇ γῆς*, whereas the Hebrew Expression of this Addition is render'd v. 15. in the Septuagint, by *οἱ παῖδες ἐν τῇ γῆς*. Whence it may be in-

XIII.
The first Reading of the Septuagint Version herealter'd, and that in two respects as to the Alexandrian MS.
fer'd

fer'd that the Septuagint did *not* take this Addition from the *Hebrew* Copy made use of by the Translators; forasmuch as *then* they would have render'd it *alike* both in v. 14 and 15, the *Hebrew* words being the *very same* according to the Samaritan Pentateuch. But this Objection is sufficiently taken away, by observing that *Eusebius*, the most ancient Father that quotes this v. 14. as I know of, quotes it as having (not *εἰς πάντα*, but) *ὡς φαίνεται ἐν τῇ γῆ*, exactly as it is render'd v. 15. in the Septuagint. Whence it may well be infer'd, that *ὡς φαίνεται*, which at first stood here v. 14, has since been chang'd into *εἰς πάντα*. Certain it is, that what else is here added in the Alexandrian MS. of the Septuagint Version, viz. *And to rule over the day and over the night*, has been added from v. 18. by some other hand, and since the former Addition, viz. *For to give light upon the Earth*; the Addition, *And to rule over the day &c*; being not found in the Primitive Writers of the Christian Church, nor in the Samaritan Pentateuch; and consequently there is no Reason at all to think the said last Addition to have been in any Hebrew Copy.

XIV.
A small Difference which is not to be counted a Various Reading; and therefore has like no more to be taken Notice of.

V. 20. The Clause which, if the Hebrew be Literally render'd, is, *Let the fowl fly above the earth*, is here render'd, *The fowl flying* (or, *that may fly*) *above the Earth*, in the Septuagint. Whence may be infer'd, that the Septuagint Interpreters read in their Copy, not the *future tense*, but the *participle*, and so it may be thought a *Various Reading*. But as 'tis confirm'd by the Samaritan Pentateuch, that the Original Reading is the Future tense, not Participle; so 'tis observable, that the small Variation made herein by the Septuagint, is to be look'd on in this or like Cases, Not as *proceeding from Various Readings* in the Hebrew Copy or Copies they used; but only from the *just Liberty taken by all Translators* to vary so Far from the Original. Accordingly, not only the Chaldee Version of *Onkelos*, but even our Own, takes the *like liberty* in this very place, We rendering it *the Fowl that may fly*, and observing in the Margin that Literally it should be render'd, *Let the fowl fly*. Wherefore I take Notice of this first Difference of this Nature, chiefly that I might give the Reader Notice, that I shall *not take Notice of Any more* of this Nature, forasmuch as they are *not to be esteem'd Various Readings*.

XV.
The Septuagint here faulty, as afore. v. 6.

Whereas the Clause, *And it was so*, is added at the end of this Verse, and is not to be found in the Hebrew, or Samaritan Pentateuch, or the aforesaid Ancient Versions; 'tis not to be doubted, but it has been *added here* in the Septuagint, from other like places in this Chapter, and that in the manner aforesaid under v. 6 and 7.

XVI.
Another Difference.

V. 27. *In his own Image* is omitted in the Septuagint, whereas it is read in the Hebrew, and Samaritan Pentateuch, and all the fore-

foresaid Old Versions. So that 'tis not to be doubted but 'tis the Original Reading; and was left out of the Septuagint, either thro' *meer Oversight* of some Transcriber on account of the *Likeness* of *this* and the *next following* expression, *In the image of God*; or perhaps *purposely* by some Transcriber who thought *One* of the said Expressions *enough*, and was willing to *shorten* his Work. Or lastly, even the Septuagint Translators themselves might leave it out, as thinking *One* of the Expressions enough, forasmuch as we meet with an Instance of the like Nature in the very next Verse. Namely,

V. 28. Whereas in the Hebrew and Samaritan Pentateuch, and all the other Versions 'tis *God blessed them, and God said unto them*, in the Septuagint 'tis shorter thus, *God blessed them, saying*. Which difference from the Original, can't be so probably attributed to the *Heedlessness* of Transcribers, as to the *design* of the Translators, who judg'd the *Sense* of the Original to be *sufficiently express'd* by such a translation, tho' *All the Words* of the Original were not express'd thereby. And this being indeed no other than a Liberty generally taken by and allow'd to all Translators; therefore hence-forward I shall omit taking Notice of this or the like Differences, as being not to be esteem'd Various Readings.

Again in the latter part of this Verse it is in the Hebrew, *And over the fowl of the Air, and over every living thing that moves on the Earth*: Whereas the Septuagint has it more particularly, *And over the Fowl of the Air, and over all Cattel, and over all the Earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the Earth*. Now as the Samaritan Pentateuch and all the other Versions aforesaid agree with the Hebrew, so the Difference in the Septuagint is not to be look'd on as a *Various Reading* arising from the Hebrew Copy used by the Translators; but only as a *Paraphrase* of what is shorter express'd in the Hebrew. And the Reason why the Septuagint Interpreters might choose thus to *Paraphrase* the Hebrew, might well be this, viz. Because the word which we here render *Living thing*, is usually render'd by them in such cases *Beast*, as v. 30. &c. and the word which we render *that moves*, literally signifies *that creeps*, as we observe in the Margin. Wherefore it being Odd to say, *Every Beast that creeps on the Earth*, they chose rather to paraphrase the Hebrew Expression, by rendring it Agreeably to the latter part of v. 26. this Clause, *Every living thing that moves on the Earth*, being evidently put in Hebrew v. 28. to denote in short, what is more fully express'd v. 26. by, *Over the Cattel, and over all the Earth, &c.*

V. 30. Here the Septuagint has, *And every green herb for meat*, whereas *And* is not in the Hebrew, or Samaritan Pentateuch, or any of the other Versions, and *hurts* the Sense rather than *helps* it.

XVII.

Another Difference not to be counted a Various Reading, and so no more to be taken Notice of.

XVIII.

A Difference arising not from Various Readings in the Hebrew, but from the Septuagint Interpreters here paraphrasing the Hebrew.

XIX.

The Septuagint here faulty.

So that it was doubtless added in the Septuagint by some heedless and ignorant Transcriber, who seeing the particle *And* used so often before in this verse, added it here also, it run so much in his head. And thus I have gone thro' Chap. I.

CHAP. II.

I.
The Reading
of the Septua-
gint Version
and Samaritan
Copy here the
true or Original
Reading ;
and the present
Hebrew Read-
ing faulty.

V. 2. Here we have a very remarkable and useful Difference. For whereas the present Hebrew Reading is, *On the Seventh Day God ended his Work which he had made* ; both the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Septuagint and the Syriac Versions have, *On the Sixth Day God ended his Work*, &c. Which last Reading, being not only in itself most plainly agreeable to matter of Fact, but also thus confirm'd by the Samaritan Copy of the Hebrew Text itself, and the Septuagint and Syriac Versions : On these considerations alone it is I think not Reasonably to be doubted, but it is the true or original Reading. However the same will further appear by considering that it can't be reasonably supposed, that the Transcriber of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Septuagint and Syriac Interpreters, were *All so very Bold with the sacred Scripture*, as wilfully to make so great a Change, as to put the *Sixth* day for the *Seventh* : Or that on the other hand, that they *all happen'd to make it by Chance or Oversight*. Nor can it be Reasonably thought, that the Septuagint followed herein the Samaritan Pentateuch, or *vice versa*, for the Reasons abovemention'd in reference to Chap. I. 14. Nor lastly, is there any good Ground to think, that the Syriac Interpreter followed herein the Septuagint, since we find it all along hitherto following the Hebrew. Wherefore it is not Reasonably to be doubted, but that the Samaritan Transcriber, and the Septuagint and Syriac Translators read all of 'em the *Sixth* day in the Hebrew Copies used by them. Lastly, it is easily to be accounted for, how it came to be read the *Seventh* Day in some Hebrew Copies. There being mention afore made Chap. I. ult. that the *Sixth* day was past ; therefore it run in the Head of some heedless and ignorant Transcriber, that the *next* Day that was mentioned here, must necessarily be in Order the *Seventh* ; and so he writ it in this Place, not heeding or looking on his Copy to see if he was Right, but going on without any more ado, and thereupon meeting presently with the mention of the *Seventh* Day in the latter part of the same Verse, it confirm'd him that he had writ Right, in writing likewise the *Seventh* Day in the Clause just afore. By this or some such Means might this Change be very likely made in some Hebrew Copy, from which it was afterwards propagated into Others, particularly those from which were transcribed the present Hebrew Text, and from which were made the

the Chaldee, Arabic and Persic Versions. Upon the whole therefore it may I think be concluded without Doubt, that in this Case the Reading of the Septuagint, viz. *the Sixth Day* is agreeable to the Original Reading of the Hebrew Text.

If Any one that has heard of the *Masorites* among the Jews *Numbring all the Words and Letters* in the Hebrew Bible, should thence imagin as some have done, that it is *Impossible for any Change to have been made since in the Hebrew Text*: to Undeceive him I need but refer him to the Various Readings of the Copies of the Hebrew Bible put forth by *Ben Ascher* and *Ben Nephtali*, and to the Various Readings of other Copies printed in the last Tome of our Polyglot Bible. But I shall inform him further, that the Various Readings of the Hebrew Text which we are here speaking of, are such as were extant *before the Numbring of the Words and Letters* by the Masorites, so that the said Industry of the Masorites therein, if otherwise sufficient, could *by no means prevent* such Various Readings. And it is sufficient to have taken Notice of *this* here *Once for All*.

II.
The Care of the Masorites not sufficient to hinder such Faults in the Hebrew Text.

V. 4, 5. Whereas the Hebrew Word, which v. 4. is render'd by us Literally *the Generations*, is render'd by the Septuagint *the Book* or rather *Account of the Generations*, this is not to be esteem'd a Various Reading, but only a *short Explication* of the Hebrew Word. Likewise whereas at the end of v. 4. there is a small Difference, arising by the *bare Transposition* of the words, *Heaven and Earth*; the Septuagint reading it so, with which agree the Samaritan Copy, and the Syriac Version; whereas it is, *Earth and Heaven*, in the Hebrew, as also Chaldee, Arabic, and Persic Versions: This difference deserves not the *Name* of a Various Reading, or at least of an *Enquiry*, Which of the two is the Original; Especially it being generally in such indifferent and small matters *most difficult* to find out the Original; there being so Many ways for such Differences to arise. It may be said for the Hebrew Reading, that it being *less usual by far* (to say no more) to place *Earth* thus *before Heaven*, 'tis therefore likely that it was *not primarily a Mistake of any Transcriber*, but Originally so in the Hebrew Text. On the other hand it may be said for the Reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch and Septuagint Version, &c. that the following Context seems to *require*, that the Words should be placed *here* as Usually, or that *Earth* should stand *last*; because immediately after, Mention is made of things *belonging not to the Heaven, but to the Earth*, viz. *Every Plant of the field*, &c. So that it is not only Odd to clap in *Heaven* thus *between the Earth* and the *things of the Earth*, as it stands in the Hebrew; but also it is contrary to the general Method of the Sacred Penmen in such Cases. And the *present Hebrew Reading*

III.
Several other Differences not to be counted Various Readings, and so no more to be taken Notice of.



may be accounted for very Well Otherwise than afore as thus: That some Transcriber having thro' mistake left out *Heaven* in its *right* or the *first* place, rather than he would blot the Copy he was writing, by *striking out* again the word *Earth*, or *blur* it by *interlining* the word *Heaven*, chose to write *Heaven* in the *last* place, as being a Matter of no moment how it stood. Lastly, whereas v. 5. and in Many other places following, What is in Hebrew *the Lord God*, is render'd in the Septuagint only *God*, or the like; this is not to be look'd on as a Various Reading, but as a Liberty which the Septuagint Interpreters might think they might take, it being sufficient to mention one, either *God* or *Lord*: Or else rather, *One* or *Other* of these two words may have been *left out by Transcribers* in After-ages, as plainly appears in many places from *Both* words being retain'd in *One* of the Greek Copies, viz. Alexandrian or Vatican, and but *One* in the *Other* Greek Copy, and the like. On the whole, the Differences in these v. 4 and 5. are so immaterial, that I shall not need Any more to take Notice of such Differences, as are here mentioned.

V. 9. See below v. 19.

IV. V. 14. Instead of, *the Name of the Third River is Tigris*, the Septuagint renders it only, *the third River is Tigris*. But neither is this to be esteem'd a Various Reading, but a Liberty allow'd to and used by the best Translators. So that such Differences need not likewise be taken any further Notice of.

V. V. 15. After *God took the Man*, the Septuagint adds, *which he had formed*. But this is not in the Hebrew, nor Samaritan Pentateuch, nor any of the other old Versions aforesaid. So that it has doubtless been added from v. 8. by means of some Criticks Observation, agreeably to what is above said more than Once.

VI. V. 17. It is in the Hebrew, *In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely dy*. Whereas in the Septuagint it is, *In the Day ye eat thereof ye shall surely dy*. But this is not to be look'd on as arising from Various Readings in the Hebrew, forasmuch as the Samaritan Copy and all the other Versions agree herein with the Hebrew; but it is owing to the Liberty the Septuagint Interpreters might think they might reasonably take, so to change the Number, it being very proper or conducive to denote, that the Prohibition to eat of the Tree of Knowledge did belong to both our first Parents. In like manner,

V. V. 18. In the Hebrew it is, *I will make an Help meet for him*, Whereas in the Septuagint it is, *Let us make an Help meet for him*. Now since the Samaritan Pentateuch and all the other Versions agree herein with the Hebrew, the Hebrew is to be counted the Original Reading: Especially because the Septuagint Interpreters might judge that they might take the Liberty to render it so in Conformity to

Chap.

Chap. I. 26. Or else some After-Critick here, (at least) referring in the Margin of his Bible to Chap. I. 26. and so placing in the said Margin *non solum*, it might thence be taken into the Version itself by Transcribers, instead of *non solum*, which might be the rend'ring of the Septuagint Interpreters themselves. There is indeed a Consideration which tends to induce One to think, that either the *Hebrew Text* had Originally, *Let us make*, or else that the same is the *Version of the Septuagint Interpreters themselves*. The Consideration is founded on this, that in the present *Vulgar Latin Version* it is, *Let us make*, as well as in the Septuagint Version. Now if here be retained the *Old Latin or Italic Version*, then there is no Wonder that the Septuagint and the said Version should so agree, forasmuch as the said *Italic Version* was made from the Septuagint according to what is said under Prop. 14. But if this be agreeable to St. Jerom's Translation from the *Hebrew*, then it seems to be an evident Proof, that the *Hebrew Copy* made use of by St. Jerom had it likewise, *Let us make*, and consequently that there was a *Variety of Readings in the Hebrew Copies themselves* in this respect. But as I am Altogether Unprejudiced or Unbias'd to all other things but the Truth in these Matters; so I cannot but observe, that since the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Targum of Onkelos and the Syriac Version, which were all undoubtedly first transcribed or made before St. Jerom's time, if the *Arabic Version* was not so likewise, which also agrees with the *Hebrew* herein: On these Considerations I can't but observe out of my Impartiality to all things but Truth, that tho' St. Jerom's Translation should have, *Let us make*, yet this would be no good Evidence that the *Hebrew Copy* he made use of, had it so likewise. For from what may be discern'd of St. Jerom's Temper from his Writings, it seems not unlikely, that notwithstanding his speaking so much of the *Veritas Hebraica*, or the Truth of the *Hebrew Copies*, in Opposition to the Septuagint Version, he might according to what is observ'd under Prop. 14. think fit herein to retain the old *Italic Version* tho' made from the Septuagint, it carrying in it a Proof of the Trinity, of which he was a Zealous Asserter as he ought to be. If neither of the aforesaid Particulars were the Cause of the present *Vulgar Latin Version* having, *Let us make*; then it must be ascribed to the much later *Papal Authority*, which takes upon it to determine Scripture, so as 'tis most Agreeable to its own Tenets. And the Doctrine of the Trinity being one of those Truths, which the Popish Church is so far in the Right as to maintain, therefore by Virtue of the *Papal Authority*, or of the Infallible Judge among the Papists they have stamp'd this Reading in the Plural to be the True Reading, and so put it in the present *Vulgar Latin Version*, tho' it may not be Agreeable to the *Hebrew Copy* made use of by St. Jerom, and is certainly

VIII.
Of the Vulgar Latin Version.

tainly not so to the *present* Hebrew Reading, which in all likelihood was the *original* Reading.

IX.
A Variety of Readings here in the Hebrew Text; and the present the Original One.

V. 19. Both v. 9. and here the Particle *וְ* is added in the Septuagint, for which there is nothing in the present Hebrew, or other old Versions, or the Samaritan Pentateuch in v. 9. But v. 19. the Samaritan Pentateuch has the Hebrew Particle which answers to the aforesaid Greek Particle. So that it is not to be doubted but it was also in the *Hebrew* Copy used by the Septuagint Interpreters, and that in both places; and consequently that there was a *Variety of Readings* in this respect in the ancient Hebrew Copies. However 'tis Reasonable to suppose, that the present Hebrew Reading is the Original, because *no good* Reason can be given why the said Particle *should be left out*, if Originally in the Hebrew Text, whereas there is a *plain* Reason or Account, why or how it *might be put in*. Namely, Some Early Jewish Doctor added at these two Verses, at least in the Margin of his Bible, the Hebrew Particle answering to *וְ* or *yet*, by way of Explication, or to denote what is here said v. 9. and 19, is to be understood *as done Yet while* the Works of the Six days were doing, and not Afterwards. And the said Marginal Note was taken into the Text by some Transcriber quickly after, or *before the First* transcribing of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and consequently *long before* the Septuagint Version was made. And by this means the *Hebrew Copies* made use of by the First Transcribers of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and by the Septuagint Interpreters *might come to have* this Particle in them, tho' other *Hebrew Copies had it not*.

X.
The Reading of the Septuagint Version and Samaritan Copy the Original one, and the present Hebrew here faulty.

V. 24. In the Septuagint 'tis, *They two shall be one Flesh*, whereas *Two* is omitted in the present Hebrew, with which agree in this Case only the *Chaldee* Version made before Christ, and the *Persic* Version which is according to *Prop. 14.* the latest of All those refer'd to in this Specimen. For with the Septuagint agree the Samaritan Pentateuch, and both the Syriac and even Arabic Versions; and What is still more, both St. *Matthew* Chap. 19. 5. and St. *Mark* Chap. 10. 8. or rather *Our Saviour himself*, whose Words are there related by the Evangelists. As they were the Words of our Saviour, so 'tis Reasonable to suppose that he spoke them *agreeably at least to some Hebrew Copies* then in use, and that he chose to speak them *agreeably to that Reading*, which he by his Omniscience *knew to be the Original* Reading. As they are express'd in both Evangelists, 'tis evident from the *Agreement of the very placing* of the Words, as well as from the *Agreement of the Words themselves* throughout this whole 24th Verse, that the *Greek* Translation of our Saviour's Words in the Gospels was taken from the Septuagint. And so it is evident that the *Two* was *then* in the Septuagint Version,

sion, and has not been added since. As to the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions agreeing herein with the Septuagint, it may be said, that their Authors being *Christians*, might therefore *choose to follow the two Evangelists rather than the Hebrew Copies* they used; which Copies therefore might not have the Word *Two*, tho' the said Versions have it. But then this can *only be said*, and *not proved*: And *even supposing it was so*, yet it shews that the Authors of the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions did therefore *prefer the Reading of the Evangelists*, because they judg'd it on that account to be most likely the *true or original Reading*. Lastly, *No good Reason* can be given for *adding the Word Two*, if it were not in the *Hebrew Originally*: for 'tis *evident* from the former part of the Verse, that when it is said, *They shall be One flesh*, by the *They* were to be understood only these *Two*, viz. the Man and his Wife. But now the *very Evidence* of this carries in it a *good Reason*, Why the Word *Two* might be *left out* of some Copies of the Hebrew, tho' Originally in the Text; namely, as being esteem'd *Needless*, or *Not at least necessary to be mention'd*, it being *Otherwise evident* that *Two* only were spoken of. On the Whole therefore the Reading of the Septuagint Version appears *beyond all Reasonable doubt* to have been here the *Original Reading*, even *setting Aside* the Testimony thereof drawn from our Saviour's Words: But *this being taken in too*, it makes the Matter *no less than Certain*. And here, together with the Second Chapter, I shall put an End to this *Specimen*, what is herein already contain'd, being sufficient for that Purpose.

F I N I S.

11 2137777

The first of these is the fact that the
 world is not a uniform whole, but is
 divided into many different parts, each
 with its own characteristics and
 its own history. This is true of the
 physical world, and it is true of the
 human world. The physical world is
 divided into many different regions, each
 with its own climate, its own flora and
 fauna, and its own history. The human
 world is divided into many different
 nations, each with its own language, its
 own customs, and its own history.

